

1 Reza Mirzaie, Esq.
2 (Pro Hac Vice)
3 *rmirzaie@raklaw.com*
4 Paul S. Kroeger, Esq.
5 (Pro Hac Vice)
6 *pkroeger@raklaw.com*
7 Stanley H. Thompson, Jr., Esq.
8 (Pro Hac Vice)
9 *sthompson@raklaw.com*
10 C. Jay Chung, Esq.
11 (Pro Hac Vice)
12 *jchung@raklaw.com*
13 **RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT**
14 12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
15 Los Angeles, California 90025
16 Telephone: (310) 826-7474
17 Facsimile: (310) 826-6991

18 Mark Borghese, Esq.
19 Nevada Bar No. 6231
20 *mark@borgheselegal.com*
21 **Borghese Legal, Ltd.**
22 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150
23 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
24 T: (702) 382-0200
25 F: (702) 382-0212

26 Attorneys for Plaintiff
27 2-WAY COMPUTING INC.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

28 2-WAY COMPUTING, INC., a Nevada
corporation,

Case No.: **2:15-cv-02235-GMN-CWH**

29 Plaintiff,

JOINT MOTION TO DISMISS

30 vs.

31 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., a California
32 corporation,

33 Defendant.

34
35 WHEREAS, Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc. ("2-Way") and Defendant Cisco Systems,
36 Inc. ("Cisco") have resolved 2-Way's claims for relief against Cisco.

1 NOW, THEREFORE, 2-Way and Cisco through their attorneys of record, request this
2 Court to dismiss 2-Way's claims for relief against Cisco with prejudice with all attorneys' fees,
3 costs of court and expenses borne by the party incurring same.

4 Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a [Proposed] Order of Dismissal with Prejudice.

5
6 Dated: June 1, 2016

7 /s/ Mark Borghese
8 Mark Borghese, Esq.
mark@borgheselegal.com
9 **BORGHESE LEGAL, LTD.**
10 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
Telephone No.: (702) 382-0200
Facsimile No.: (702) 382-0212

11
12 Reza Mirzaie (*pro hac vice*)
13 Paul S. Kroeger (*pro hac vice*)
Stanley H. Thompson, Jr. (*pro hac vice*)
14 C. Jay Chung (*pro hac vice*)
15 **RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT**
16 12424 Wilshire Boulevard
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: 310.826.7474
17 Counsel for Plaintiff

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Respectfully submitted,

7 /s/ Matthew S. Yungwirth
8 Manita Rawat (Nevada Bar No.: 9656)
9 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**
10 100 North City Parkway, Suite 1560
Las Vegas, NV 89106-4617
Telephone No.: (702) 868-2600

11 L. Norwood Jameson (*pro hac vice*)
wjameson@duanemorris.com
12 Matthew S. Yungwirth (*pro hac vice*)
msyungwirth@duanemorris.com
13 Jennifer H. Forte (*pro hac vice*)
jhforte@duanemorris.com
14 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**
15 1075 Peachtree Street, Suite 2000
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
16 Telephone: 404.253.6900

17 Christopher J. Tyson (*pro hac vice*)
cjtyson@duanemorris.com
18 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**
19 505 9th Street NW., Ste. 1000
Washington, DC 20004
20 Telephone: 202-776-7851

21 Counsel for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am a resident of Clark County, Nevada and am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the action. My business address is: 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89145.

On June 1, 2016, I served this document on the parties listed on the attached service list via one or more of the methods of service described below as indicated next to the name of the served individual or entity by a checked box:

PERSONAL SERVICE: by personally hand-delivering or causing to be hand delivered by such designated individual whose particular duties include delivery of such on behalf of the firm, addressed to the individual(s) listed, signed by such individual or his/her representative accepting on his/her behalf. A receipt of copy signed and dated by such an individual confirming delivery of the document will be maintained with the document and is attached.

EMAIL: By transmitting a copy of the document to the electronic-mail address designated by the attorney or the party who has consented to such manner of service.

E-FILE: Automatically through the court's electronic filing system.

FAX SERVICE: by transmitting to a facsimile machine maintained by the attorney or the party who has consented to such manner of service.

MAIL SERVICE: by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Las Vegas, Nevada. I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence by mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage fully prepaid at Las Vegas, Nevada in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing an affidavit.

I declare that under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada that the above is true and correct. I further declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

/s/ Mark Borghese

An employee of BORGHESE LEGAL, LTD.

1
2 **SERVICE LIST**
3

| 4 ATTORNEYS 5 OF RECORD | 6 PARTIES 7 REPRESENTED | 8 METHOD OF 9 SERVICE |
|--|------------------------------------|---|
| 10 Jennifer H. Forte 11 L. Norwood Jameson 12 Manita Rawat 13 Christopher Tyson 14 Matthew S. Yungwirth 15 DUANE MORRIS LLP 16 100 North City Parkway, Suite 1560 17 Las Vegas, NV 89106-4617 18 19 1075 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 2000 20 Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3929 21 22 505 9th Street NW 23 Washington, DC 20004-2166 | 24 Attorneys for 25 Defendant | 26 <input type="checkbox"/> Personal service 27 <input type="checkbox"/> Email 28 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-File 29 <input type="checkbox"/> Fax service 30 <input type="checkbox"/> Mail service |

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

2-WAY COMPUTING, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Plaintiff,
vs.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., a California corporation,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:15-cv-02235-GMN-CWH

**[PROPOSED] ORDER OF DISMISSAL
WITH PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc. (“2-Way”) and Defendant Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) announced to the Court that they have resolved 2-Way’s claims for relief against Cisco asserted in this case. 2-Way and Cisco have therefore requested that the Court dismiss 2-Way’s claims for relief against Cisco with prejudice with all attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses taxed against the party incurring same. The Court, having considered this request, is of the opinion that their request for dismissal should be granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that 2-Way’s claims for relief against Cisco are dismissed with prejudice. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all attorneys’ fees, costs of court and expenses shall be borne by each party incurring the same.

IT IS SO ORDERED:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: June 2, 2016